



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

I. ERETRIA: HISTORICAL SKETCH.

The recent excavations at Eretria justify an attempt to make a picture as full as possible of the rise, the continuance, and the decay of that important city, with the help of scattered literary notices and of inferences from the somewhat impressive remains.

We find Eretria¹ existing at the time of the composition of the Catalogue of the Ships, the Domesday Book of Greece. It appears without epithet or description in *Iliad*, ii. 537. Perhaps not without some significance is it named second among the Eubœan cities, Chalkis being mentioned first. When it emerges into the light or rather into the twilight of history (Thouk. i. 15), it is engaged in disputing with Chalkis the right to the first place. The boldness with which it reached out and laid claim to the Lelantine Plain, which lay so much nearer to Chalkis, argues a long period of prosperity in which it had developed opulence and power. But it is idle to hope for more than here and there a suggestion, throwing a little light on that period. One such suggestion is found in Herod., v. 57, where it is said that the ancestors of Harmodios and Aristogeiton claimed to have come from Eretria originally, but that closer investigation led to the belief that they were Phœnicians, who, coming to Boiotia with Kadmos, settled at Tanagra. Any one who sails up the Euripos on a clear day will be impressed with the nearness of the plain around Tanagra to the shore of Eubœia. Considering that waterways are bonds and not divisions, one may say that Tanagra and Eretria belong to the same great natural amphitheatre surrounded by mountains.² This close connection being realized, it seems probable in advance that any Phœnician immigration which reached Boiotia (and this is the only side of Boiotia open to Phœnician immigration) would have included also the Eubœan shore. The passage in Herodotos comes in to give almost a certainty to a reasonable conjecture. Both reports between which Herodotos felt bound to choose were very likely correct. We may put the Gephyræans down as Phœnicians from the region of Eretria and Tanagra.

¹ In spite of its maritime associations, the name, in view of other inland Eretrias and the variant *Ἀπορπία* (STRABO, p. 447), means probably not "oar-town," but "plow-town." TOZER, *Geogr. of Greece*, p. 250.

² It is in fact one of the most striking signs of the humiliation of Boiotia that Athens reached across or around these mountain barriers and exercised a controlling influence in the affairs of Chalkis and Eretria.

If one seeks for corroborations of Phœnician occupation of Eretria, he finds among the several stories that Strabo has to tell of the origin of the city, one which is to the point. He says (p. 447) that the Arabians who came over with Kadmos (*Ἀραβες οἱ Κάδμω συνδιαβάντες*) stayed behind in Chalkis and Eretria. But perhaps it is an impertinence to hunt after scattered literary notices, when we have the facts of the presence of the murex along the Euripos (Arist., *Hist. An.*, v. 15) and the copper-industry of Chalkis. Wherever there were purple and copper, there were Phœnicians. We can hardly think of the Phœnicians as occupying Chalkis without including Eretria also. Here were harbor, plain, and acropolis, as at Corinth and Nauplia. We may, then, think of Phœnicians awakening here, as they did everywhere along the coasts that they touched, the ruder Hellenes to a new life.³ Accordingly Chalkis and Eretria developed early. While Athens and Sparta are still slumbering, these cities are founding colonies from Chalkidike to Cumæ. In the eighth century B. C. they had their blooming period. Miletos and Samos did not develop until a century later, and when they came to the front the Eubœan cities were already on the decline.⁴

It is impossible to trace with certainty anything of the Phœnician settlement at Eretria. Perhaps it was on the peninsula forming the east side of the present harbor. This peninsula was once longer and wider than at present. It is still about 600 ft. long and about 300 ft. wide at its widest part. The action of wind and wave both up and down the Euripos seems destined to wear it away entirely. Even now it is an island at some hours of the day. It contains numerous remains of walls of the Macedonian or the Roman period. What at first appeared to be traces of very old walls much disintegrated proved to be an illusion.

Strabo gives traditions of early settlements in Eretria from Attika and the Peloponnesos, which it is difficult to prove. The immigration from Elis, which is probably separate from that from Triphylia, he attempts to substantiate by appealing to the prevalence of the Elean rhotacism in Eretria.⁵ Perhaps the mixture of many races, Abantes,

³ DONDORFF, *Die Ioner auf Eubœa*, p. 29.

⁴ HOLM, *Lange Fehde*, in *Abhandlungen zu Ernst Curtius' 70tem Geburtstag*.

⁵ It is interesting that a Eubœan inscription, published in the *Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική*, for 1872, containing the text of a treaty between Eretria and Histiaia, shows several instances of rhotacism, e. g., *δπόραι*, *ἐ[ρχ]ουριν*, *παραβαίνωριν*. Others in *Ἐφημ. Ἀρχ.*, 1887, p. 82, *seq.*, and 1890, p. 195, *seq.*

Phœnicians, Ionians, and Æolians, gave to Eretria that alertness which marked it in a peculiar degree.

In the long period of prosperity before the Lelantine War, which made Chalkis and Eretria famous, a sad emerging into history, the two cities went hand in hand. This Curtius finds indicated by the name "Eubœic talent," supposing that had the cities been antagonistic the talent would have been named after one or the other of them.⁶ Perhaps they made a mistake in founding colonies conjointly or near together, as in Chalkidike.⁷ When the war broke out it is supposed to have been conducted with a bitterness⁸ which seems to have been born years before. It is not unlikely that colonial troubles had as much to do with the break as the rich plain between the two cities.⁹ The quarrel was fought out with the help of many allies on each side.¹⁰ The Greek world was divided into two hostile camps, a division which showed itself for centuries. Eretria was vanquished without losing her independence or her honorable standing. The two neighbor cities never tried conclusions again, and lived amicably, except when the questions connected with Athenian or Macedonian rule in later times threw them temporarily into hostile camps. Eretria, however, appears to have had a good understanding with Athens in the very period when, shortly before the Persian Wars, Chalkis was conquered by Athens and made an Athenian possession.

The date of the Lelantine War is shown by Curtius¹¹ to have been the middle of the eighth century B. C. Eretria had still nearly three centuries of history before its first destruction. It now abandoned that extensive scheme of colonization which, with its rivalries, must have been quite a drain upon its population, and now probably reached its maximum. To this time we may refer the stele in the temple of Artemis Amarysia,¹² the principal sanctuary of Eretria, standing about

⁶ *Hermes*, x, p. 223. ⁷ Eretria took as its field Athos and Pallene; STRABO, 447.

⁸ The curious compact mentioned in the corrupt passage in STRABO, p. 448, not to use weapons thrown from a distance (*μη χρῆσθαι τηλεβόλοις*), may refer to the heat of the struggle in which both parties wished to kill at close quarters, or to a desire to rule out what seemed to them contrary to proper procedure on the part of scientific warriors. PLUTARCH, *Thes.*, 5, and the passage there quoted from ARCHILOCHOS would favor the latter view.

⁹ E. CURTIUS, in *Hermes*, x, p. 219.

¹⁰ HOLM, *Lange Fehde; Thouk.*, I. 15.

¹¹ *Hermes*, x, p. 220.

¹² This title, which survives in the name of the Attic village Marousi (LEAKE, *Demi of Attica*, p. 41), was one under which the goddess was worshipped in Attika with no less zeal than at Eretria. PAUS., i. 31. 4.

a mile outside the walls, on which stele, according to Strabo, p. 448, was inscribed a record showing that the Eretrians used to make their great procession out to the temple with three thousand hoplites, six hundred cavalry and sixty chariots. To the same time also we may refer the Eretrian control over Andros, Tenos, Keos, and other islands.¹³ Then probably the Eretrians set up at Olympia the big bronze bull, the companion piece to the one dedicated by their friends the Kerkyræans.¹⁴

At the time of the famous wooing of Agariste, in the first half of the sixth century B. C., Eretria was, according to Herod., VI. 127, in its bloom (*ἀνθεύσης τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον*). That Eretria alone of all Greece shared with Athens the attempt to aid the Ionians in their revolt against Darius (Herod., v. 99), speaks well for its prosperity and its spirit. Two things we must not forget in connection with this expedition: first, that it was on Eretria's part the payment of a debt to Miletos for services rendered in the Lelantine War;¹⁵ secondly, that Eretria was in such intimate relations with Athens as to give some color to the story mentioned by Strabo, that Eretria was colonized from an Attic Eretria.

We are not likely to forget the consequences to Eretria of this assistance rendered to the Ionians. In the year 490 B. C., when the opportunity at last came for fulfilling his vow against the Athenians, Darius was not in such haste to take vengeance on these principal abettors of the revolted Ionians, now subdued, that he could forget the Eretrians. On them first fell the blow. The story is told briefly and graphically by Herodotos (VI. 100). In her hour of need Eretria stood alone, with divided counsels and traitors in her walls besides. She did ask Athens for help, and, if we may believe Herodotos, Athens acted not ungenerously. It could hardly be expected that the main body of Athenian troops should go over to Eubœia to meet the Persians. That would have been to give Athens to the Persians on the chance of saving Eretria. But Athens assigned to Eretria the four thousand Athenian kleruchs of Chalkis. These, however, did not stay. Before it came to an actual conflict they were off to Oropos, which is the last

¹³ STRABO, p. 448.

¹⁴ PAUS., v. 27. 9.

¹⁵ This Ionian revolt was Miletos' affair. It is noteworthy that the Samians, the enemies of Miletos and Eretria in the Lelantine War, ruined the Ionian cause by deserting almost in a body to the Persians in the naval battle on which all was staked. HEROD., VI. 14.

we hear of them. They do not appear to have done service either at Marathon or before Athens.¹⁶

Left alone, the Eretrians voted down the suggestion of retiring to the mountains, and, deciding not to risk an engagement in the open, retired within their walls and defended themselves for six days, incurring and inflicting great losses. On the seventh day, two traitors, Euphorbos and Philagros, betrayed the city to the Persians, who destroyed the temples and enslaved all the inhabitants, who, after witnessing the discomfiture of the Persians at Marathon from an island near by, were taken away on the Persian fleet and settled in the heart of the Persian dominion.

Yet Eretria did not lose its corporate existence, for ten years later its seven ships appear in the lists of the Greeks who fought at Artemision and Salamis.¹⁷ At Plataia also it furnished with Styra (which was probably an insignificant appendage, as it sent only two ships to the Greek fleet; Herod., VII. 1) a contingent of six hundred men drawn up in line next to the four hundred Chalkidians.¹⁸ Its name was carved on the tripod-standard of serpents, set up at Delphi, that roll of honor of the victorious Greeks. It is still "plain for all folks to see," on the fourth inscribed coil, reckoning from the bottom. Probably there were refugees enough to form a nucleus of a city immediately after the withdrawal of the Persians from Marathon.¹⁹ Herodotos does not say that anything was destroyed except its temples. Greek dwellings, for that matter, if destroyed, were soon replaced. Whatever walls then existed could not easily have been overthrown. A gate or two might have been broken down, but the Persians surely had no time and probably no tools to wreck such walls as those the remains of which are now to be seen on the acropolis of Eretria. They waited only *ὀλίγας ἡμέρας*, and then went on to Marathon.

¹⁶ WECKLEIN, *Tradition der Perserkriege*, p. 39, supposes that Herodotos has here, as usual, colored his narrative in the interest of the Athenians, in inserting the story of an Eretrian, Aischines, sending word to the Athenian allies that traitors were going to give Eretria to the Persians, and that it was time to act on the principle *saue qui peut*. The fear of "the men clad in the Persian garb" was probably still strong enough to induce these allies to get across to Oropos as soon as possible without being sent away.

¹⁷ HEROD., VIII. 1 and 46.

¹⁸ HEROD., IX. 28, 31.

¹⁹ Considering the great talk of taking refuge in the mountains and of the likelihood that the city was to be betrayed, it would be very strange if many at least of the non-combatants had not taken refuge individually according to the suggestion.

The great question in regard to the topography of Eretria is whether or not the present acropolis walls are those of the pre-Persian city. I believe that they are pre-Persian, and the very walls to which the scattered Eretrians who were not carried off to Asia returned. But for a single passage in Strabo, no one would ever have supposed that a city like the pre-Persian Eretria could have been established anywhere along this coast except on this very hill. Settlers who left this out, and chose another spot near by, would have become more proverbial in Greece than the "blind men" who chose Chalkedon and left Byzantion to later arrivals. But Strabo (p. 403), in reckoning distances from the Boeotian side to the Eubæan side of the gulf, makes a distinction between Old Eretria and New Eretria, which would seem to locate the pre-Persian city a little over a mile to the east of the later one. In spite of the doubt whether Strabo ever visited this region, and in spite of his colossal errors in regard to places which he has not visited,²⁰ geographers have generally sought to identify some of the foundations of walls to the east of the acropolis with old Eretria. It is refreshing to find recently a spirit of revolt against this slavery to a passage of Strabo. Lolling, in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* (III, p. 192), says simply: *Eine Stelle weiter östlich wurde als Alt-Eretria bezeichnet*. The same author in the *Mittheilungen d. deutschen archäolog. Institutes in Athen*, vol. x, p. 353, says: *Das Schweigen der Historiker und aller anderen Schriftsteller berechtigt uns zu der Annahme, dass die Bezeichnung der Fundamente unweit der Stadt als Alt-Eretria auf eine Linie zu stellen ist mit der jetzigen Bezeichnung Paläochora, für eine Ortschaft deren Name verschollen ist*.²¹ Strabo being treated as a reporter of traditions, we may make Lolling's words (*l. c.*) our own: *An eine wirkliche Verlegung der Stadt, und noch dazu an eine so nahe liegende andere Stelle, wird Niemand glauben, denn so gewiss die Stadtgründung Athens sich an die Akropolis anschloss, so deutlich ist auch die vortretende Höhe des eretrischen Olympos von Natur zur Akropolis einer grösseren Stadtgründung des Nord-Attika gegenüber liegenden Küstenstrichs prädestinirt*.

But, besides the impression which one gets from sojourning in Eretria that here and here only must the city have found its acropolis,

²⁰ For the confusion between Kirrha and Krissa cf. STRABO, p. 416.

²¹ In addition to the several cases of "Alt-Theben," which Lolling adduces, the striking case of Palaia Larissa might be adduced, the name under which Krannon was hidden until it was brought forth by Leake.

the remaining walls make upon any one first and last an impression of great antiquity. If it is not absolutely certain that they are pre-Persian, it is certain that they cannot be much *later* than the Persian War.²² But for a mere remnant of returning fugitives, who would lay out a new acropolis of such large proportions? It is clear that the existing acropolis belonged originally to a large and prosperous city. Here is a homogeneous system of polygonal wall more than a mile in extent, with towers of polygonal masonry at irregular intervals, enclosing the whole area of the acropolis hill, which slopes to the south and the harbor, but falls off abruptly on its other sides. One may suppose New Eretria in these old walls to have regained gradually new life and strength, leaning perhaps on the arm of Athens.²³ In the time of Perikles, 446 B. C., it seems to have been recalcitrant with the rest of Euboea, and to have required the controlling influence of some Athenian kleruchs.²⁴ At last, in 411 B. C., it threw off the Athenian yoke in a rather treasonable manner. The Athenian fleet being beaten by the Spartans in a naval engagement off the harbor, a disaster brought about largely by the Eretrians having refused to furnish supplies, many Athenians escaped to Eretria as to a friendly city, and were immediately put to death by the Eretrians.²⁵

Something of the history of the period subsequent to the Persian War we may trace in the walls. The first use of returning prosperity would naturally be the repair and strengthening of these walls. At the northeast angle was always one principal entrance, the approach to which was flanked by a wall over 100 feet long, departing from the main wall at a very acute angle, and so forcing an enemy to approach the entrance between two nearly parallel walls. The entrance, at the junction of the two walls, was protected by one of the polygonal towers mentioned above.²⁶ This may have been the very entrance through

²² These walls are not unlike the earlier walls of the acropolis of the Boeotian Orchomenos, or those of Kastriza, near Joannina, which was supposed by Leake to be ancient Dodona.

²³ It is a question what Xerxes' fleet would have done to a restored Eretria as it passed along down the Euripos in plain sight of it.

²⁴ Cf. *CLA*, I, 339; *THOUK.*, I. 114.

²⁵ *THOUK.*, VIII. 95.

²⁶ See the plan accompanying Mr. PICKARD's article on the Topography of Eretria. There is a similar arrangement on the west side, where remains of two outlying towers are found, and a line of wall from one of these to a gate in the main enclosing-wall. From the other tower to the main wall we must assume also a line of wall, though it is now impossible to trace it.

which the Persians passed. Whether they broke it down or not, it has evidently been remodelled on a large scale, and made the one principal entrance. Two large towers, one at the corner of the main wall, and another at a lower level at the end of the projecting wall, make a strong defense of the approach to the long lane through which the enemy must still pass after having forced this approach. These towers are built much more in regular courses than the older towers, but even they could hardly be later than the Peloponnesian War. On the east side and also on the north side, a massive tower has been added at places where the wall seemed to need strengthening. Though all these added towers display the same general plan, the north tower is the most regular in construction, and so probably the last one built. It has no organic connection with the old wall, but is built up against it, while the east tower is built right across the wall. All this work seems to have been completed before the Macedonian period.

At the time of the formation of the Second Athenian Confederacy, 378 B. C., Eretria cheerfully joined it.²⁷ At this time Eretria had probably become, if not relatively as large as before its destruction, because the other cities of Greece had grown rapidly since the Persian Wars, yet absolutely as large. This may be inferred from the extent of the walls of the lower town. Along the bay, on which the modern village stands, and at some distance to the east of it, run these walls, with finely laid foundations, joining the acropolis to the harbor and enclosing a space large enough for a city of 40,000 inhabitants, as the old Greeks used to quarter themselves. We cannot suppose these walls to be a huge shell created for a population about to come, by a visionary like Otho, who laid out the modern village. Their structure would admit of referring them to the third century, but it is more likely that they belong to the fourth. To this same period we may assign the theatre, which was remodelled from time to time. After Leuktra and the breaking up of the Athenian Confederacy, the period of prosperity for Eretria was doubtless seriously impeded by the rapid changes in its foreign relations, which were always accompanied by factions at home.²⁸ In 366, a certain Themison, who was in control of Eretria, wrested Oropos from the

²⁷ DIODOR., XV. 30; CIA, II, 1, 17.

²⁸ For a vivid picture of the unhappy condition of Eubœa at this time, see CURTIUS, *Gesch. Griech.*, III, p. 589.

Athenians and turned it over to the Thebans.²⁹ When Philip began to play a controlling part in Greek affairs, it is certain that the Eubœans did not view his encroachments with that deathly anxiety with which Demosthenes watched them. They had already become somewhat accustomed to being a football between larger powers. There was always a large party in the different cities inclined to seek salvation through Philip. Perhaps it required as much fomenting on the part of Athens to keep the anti-Macedonian spirit alive as it cost Philip to lay it. From Philip's occupation of Amphipolis and his first serious break with the Athenians to his victory at Chaironeia, a period of nearly twenty years, Eretria can have had little settled quiet. It emerges into the light, but into the distorted light of the orations of Demosthenes and Aischines. Men, called by Demosthenes tyrants, followed one another in quick succession. These were, doubtless, men who obtained influence with their fellow citizens much in the same way that Perikles and Demosthenes obtained it at Athens. Sometimes, however, they may have owed their elevation to their influence with the foreign power. Of these so called tyrants, Themison and Kleitarchos³⁰ were Philip's men; Menestratos³¹ guided affairs for a while in the interest of Athens. Ploutarchos, on whom the Athenians counted, proved to be their worst enemy, abandoning them almost to their ruin in the battle of Tamynai, 350 B. C., to which he had invited them as allies to dispossess his rival Kleitarchos and win the city for themselves.³² This second treachery of Eretria, from which the Athenians escaped only by the presence of mind and the masterly generalship of Phokion, must have given the Eretrians a bad name at Athens. Yet in 340 B. C. we find Athens, in a magnificent burst of enthusiasm evoked by Demosthenes, driving out the last and worst of the tyrants, Kleitarchos, and freeing Eretria for the last time.³³

In Demosthenes' reference to Eretrian affairs, frequent mention is made of Porthmos.³⁴ This seems to have been some harbor of Eretrian territory, perhaps identical with the present port of Aliveri, the

²⁹ Cf. DEM., XVIII. 99, AISCHIN., III. 85. In 357 B. C. the Athenians "freed" Eubœia, as they called it; *i. e.*, they once more obtained a controlling influence, by breaking down the power of Thebes in the island by an expedition suggested by Timotheos and participated in by Demosthenes: DEM., XVIII. 99. Probably Eretria shared in the benefits of this deliverance, whatever they were.

³⁰ DEM., IX. 57 f.

³¹ DEM., XXIII. 124.

³² AISCHIN., III. 86 ff; PLUTARCH, *Phok.*, 12 f.

³³ DEM., XVIII. 87; DIODOR., XVI. 74.

³⁴ DEM., IX. 33, 58; XVIII. 71; XIX. 87.

town of Aliveri corresponding to Tamynai.³⁵ But what we read in some commentaries: "Porthmos was the harbor of Eretria," is certainly nonsense. Eretria had a good harbor of its own immediately under its own walls. So complete was its identity with the city that it could hardly be possible that it should bear a separate name.

It must have been almost a comfort to Eretria and the rest of Euboia when they were at last landed in the Macedonian camp, and knew where they were. So well content were the Eretrians, that when the Macedonians showed signs of falling before the Romans, they were in no haste to change masters. The report which Livy (XXII. 16) gives of the stubborn resistance here offered to the combined fleets of Attalos, the Romans, and the Rhodians, indicates no falling off in valor since the days when the Persians were before the gates; while the great number of statues and paintings (*plura quam pro urbis magnitudine*), taken by the conquerors, speaks well for the refinement of the city under Macedonian rule. It had not, even in former days, been wholly neglected by the Muses and Graces. The poet Achaios was a native of Eretria,³⁶ even if greater Athens claimed him as hers in his later years. Here also was a school of philosophy, founded by Menedemos, a disciple of Plato.³⁷ The Macedonian period was a good time for the philosophers to sit and think.

At about the beginning of the Macedonian period we find Eretria beginning to wrestle with its hydra, the great swamp on the east side of the town. In an inscription discovered at Chalkis and published in the *Ἐφημερίς Ἀρχαιολογική*, 1869, p. 1 ff., it is recorded that a certain Chairephanes agrees to drain the marsh (*λίμνη*) in at most four years. For this he was to have the use of the recovered land for ten years at an annual rent of thirty talents. The editor of the inscription, Eustratiades, puts its date at 340–278 B. C. At any rate, it was of a time when the city was still independent. The *βουλή* and the *δημος* appear as in possession of authority.

Under Roman dominion Eretria continued to flourish. At the time of Augustus it was still the second city of Euboia.³⁸ It was nominally free, too, after the battle of Kynoskephalai.³⁹ If actually under the Roman rule, it at least enjoyed the privilege of being freed from that of Athens. There is one wall on the acropolis which, by the presence of mortar, is distinctly marked as Roman. This is the cross-wall high

³⁵ STRABO, p. 448.

³⁶ ATHENAIOS, X, p. 251, c.

³⁷ ATHENAIOS, II, p. 55, D.

³⁸ STRABO, p. 446.

³⁹ POLYB., XVIII. 30.

up on the hill.⁴⁰ There are also several repaired places of uncertain date in the main wall, some of them most likely of the Byzantine time.

In the Byzantine period Eretria may be said to have no history. It is with a real sense of loss that we find the half dozen lines devoted to Eretria in Stephanos of Byzantion largely taken up in telling how to form and decline the gentile nouns. It may have been prosperous for a long time after its records cease for us. Indeed, the numerous Byzantine graves, found often in layers above earlier ones, would seem to indicate that a great many people died in Eretria during that time. Whether at last the city perished by the breath of its own pestilential bogs or by some unnamed incursion of barbarians, we cannot tell. At any rate, it seems not to have played any rôle beside Chalkis in the wars of the Turks and Venetians.

The attempt of King Otho to revive an ancient city on the site of the lower town was a fight against nature. The brave Psariots could fight the Turks, but fever-bogs conquered them; and now the wide streets are given up to grass, and the empty houses stand deep in water in winter and spring. The Naval School, looming up above the other houses, looks mournful with its windowless and roofless walls. In spite of the visionary scheme of the king, in another century the site will probably be again as desolate as that of Eretria's ancient ally, Miletos.

RUFUS B. RICHARDSON.

II. INSCRIPTIONS DISCOVERED AT ERETRIA, 1891.

1. ▨ I O T H [B]ιότη
 ▨ ΠΙΣΤΟΤΕΛΟΥ [A]ριστοτέλου

On a fragment of a marble stele 55 × 42 centimetres, broken at the bottom. The letters, 2 centimetres high, are neatly cut with almost imperceptible apices. The distinctive letters for forming an accurate judgment as to the date of the inscription are wanting, but neither the form of the genitive in *ου* nor the slight curve in the horizontal lines of the letters necessitates putting it later than the third century B. C. This inscription gains an importance hardly to be ascribed to any of the other thirty epitaphs discovered, owing to the possibility (one can hardly claim more than that) of some connection with the great Aristotle, who died at Chalkis. The elegance of the marble tomb in which it was found, apparently the finest in

⁴⁰ See plan with Mr. Pickard's article.